

8-20-1967

In a Montana Mood - Washington, D.C. - University of Montana Foundation Dinner

Mike Mansfield 1903-2001

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield_speeches

Recommended Citation

Mansfield, Mike 1903-2001, "In a Montana Mood - Washington, D.C. - University of Montana Foundation Dinner" (1967). *Mike Mansfield Speeches*. 669.
https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield_speeches/669

This Speech is brought to you for free and open access by the Mike Mansfield Papers at ScholarWorks at University of Montana. It has been accepted for inclusion in Mike Mansfield Speeches by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at University of Montana. For more information, please contact scholarworks@mso.umt.edu.

Senate

MONDAY, AUGUST 28, 1967

S12286

THE UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL SHOULD TURN ITS ATTENTION TO VIETNAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is cause for deep concern that the U.N. Security Council has not turned its attention to the situation in Vietnam. According to the United Nations Charter, the Security Council has "primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security." Yet for many months now, while hostilities in Vietnam have steadily intensified, the Security Council has remained aloof from a conflict that is unquestionably the greatest threat to international peace and security today.

Mr. President, I fully agree with those

distinguished Members who believe that Security Council action on Vietnam is long overdue, and that an initiative by the U.S. Government on this urgent matter would be highly desirable. A U.S. resolution on Vietnam has been on the agenda of the Security Council since early 1966. There is nothing to prevent a motion by the United States or any other Security Council member that this resolution be taken up; there is no obstacle to insistence by the United States that such a motion be voted; and there can be no looming veto if there should be a favorable vote, for such a motion would be procedural.

It is of utmost importance that we explore every possible means of bringing about an honorable settlement in Vietnam. It is equally essential that we not cease to make clear our willingness to exploit all available public and private forums to this end. In my judgment, we have not thus far adequately tapped the resources of the United Nations. An initiative by the United States to revive its resolution or by some other Security Council member to offer one of its own would hopefully lead the Security Council to assume its responsibilities in the vital matter of Vietnam.

Mr. President, I have had the privilege of serving as a member of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations. I have no illusions that the United Nations Security Council or any other organ of the United Nations can bring about a rapid settlement of the tangled issues in the tragic Vietnam conflict. I do know, however, that the Security Council with its small but varied membership, provides a good forum for the airing of issues, for the clarification of the positions of the parties, and for the mobilization of world concern. I know also, that there is no procedural obstacle to inviting all the parties to a conflict, whether they be U.N. members or not, whether they be belligerent groups of governments, to participate in Security Council deliberations.

Most important, I know on the basis of experience that only a small part of the deliberations and exchanges of view and searchings for compromise at the United Nations takes place in the glare of the television lights. When the Security Councils becomes seized of a vital issue, the diplomatic community of the world is mobilized, not only in the Council chamber but also in the corridors and offices of the United Nations and of member missions to the United Nations.

Mr. President, it is time we took steps to mobilize the diplomatic community of the world on the subject of Vietnam. I am in full accord with the view that the United States should act now to bring a conflict fraught with dangers for all the nations of the world before the Security Council.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The United States should insist that the Vietnam war situation be brought before the Security Council of the United Nations.

We should not hold back action because we fear that France or Russia

might veto our efforts to bring this conflict to an end.

In fact, this is one overwhelming reason why the United States should insist on action by the United Nations in order to place responsibility where it belongs.

Communist nations, led by Red China and Russia, have so successfully propagandized the world that a large majority of the nations now believe that the United States and the United States alone is responsible for the heavy property destruction and loss of life now being wrought in both North and South Vietnam.

I have never condoned the heavy bombing of North Vietnam.

It seemed like an exercise in futility bound to defeat the purpose for which it was intended.

I strongly disapprove some of our operations in South Vietnam which have led to excessive profiteering and unparalleled corruption in that area.

I object strenuously, however, to the charge that the United States alone is responsible for the holocaust of Vietnam.

Had Russia been willing to join with England in reconvening the Geneva Conference as approved by both sides to the conflict a few years ago, it is probable that North Vietnam would not have been bombed.

Had Russia not made every effort to intensify and continue the war, thereby intending to weaken the United States militarily, economically and politically, it is unlikely that Red China would have been spurred to the development of a nuclear weapons program which already excels that of France and which can, in a few years time, pose a threat to either Russia or the United States.

It is also a common charge that Russia, working through Cuba, is even now undertaking to create other Vietnams in Latin America.

It is also charged that the President of France, without the support of the French people, is promoting insurrection in North America.

It is time that France and Russia faced up to these charges.

By insisting upon action by the United Nations, the United States can force the issue.

If either or both of these nations vetoes any effort to bring the Vietnam war to an end, they will have admitted their guilt before the world.

If they agree to the responsibility of the U.N. as an organization dedicated to the preservation of world peace, then it will be possible to restore peace in Southeast Asia.

I earnestly trust that President Johnson will force this issue to a decision in the U.N.—one way or another—and that the United States will honor such decision.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to support the statement by the majority leader to Members of this body. The distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the Senator

from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], in particular, have urged that the United Nations endeavor to bring to an end the tragic fighting now going on in Vietnam.

The Secretary General, Mr. U Thant, has tried time after time in his personal capacity to bring about negotiations between hostile parties. Thus far his efforts have been without success. But it is my personal view that he deserves the gratitude of all mankind for his work for peace.

Reasonable men may differ about the best way of getting participants and interested parties to the Vietnam negotiating table. But I do not see how reasonable men can object to submitting the subject of the war in Vietnam to discussion in the United Nations, and specifically in the Security Council.

Almost overlooked because of our daily preoccupation with bombing missions, casualties, and the elections is the effort made by the United States in early 1966 to get the Security Council to consider the situation in Vietnam.

On January 31, 1966, Ambassador Goldberg, acting largely at the instigation of Members of the Senate, submitted a resolution to the Security Council calling for "immediate discussions without preconditions—among the appropriate interested governments to arrange a conference looking toward the application of the Geneva Accords of 1954 and 1962 and the establishment of a durable peace in Southeast Asia."

The effort came to naught for procedural reasons which I will not examine now. However, the point I wish to emphasize is that hostilities in Vietnam threaten world peace and for that reason there is no more important subject for consideration by the United Nations. Despite that fact, there is little evidence that either our Government or governments of other members of the United Nations are giving any high priority to promoting public, United Nations debate of the war in Vietnam. I can well imagine that if a dozen members of the United Nations were as persistent in their efforts to promote a United Nations-Vietnam settlement as some Members of this body we might get some action.

I urge our representative at the United Nations to take every step possible to raise this issue again. I also suggest that consideration be given to allowing representatives of the National Liberation Front to present their views for the consideration of the Council.

It is quite clear to me that the NLF is a very important element in this tragic struggle, and that the true relationship of the NLF to this struggle has been misunderstood very broadly. This has resulted from the erroneous view of administration spokesmen that the war in South Vietnam was not originally and primarily a civil war among rival factions in the south.

A full discussion of the matter in the Security Council might result in recommendations which could lead to a cease-fire and settlement of this tragic and disastrous conflict.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, would the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I rise to support the position of the majority leader of the Senate, a position he has taken for many years, and which he has emphasized more strongly in recent weeks.

The submission of the issue of the war in Vietnam to the United Nations and its acceptance of jurisdiction would be a blessing, a blessing to the people of Vietnam and to the people of the United States who have borne so long the responsibility of establishing the rule of law in Vietnam.

It is argued by some that the submission of the issue of Vietnam to the Security Council would be of no avail; that jurisdiction would not be accepted by the Security Council; or that its recommendations would be vetoed or that they would not be accepted. This argument of possible failure is no argument against the duty of our country to submit the issue or the responsibility of the members of the Security Council to work for a peaceful and just settlement of the war.

The war in Vietnam, which our country did not desire and which it has sought to settle by negotiation, has reached, in the terms of the charter, a stage, the continuance of which endangers international peace and security.

The United States has no interest in Vietnam that is not shared by all other members of the United Nations who genuinely seek peace and the rule of law.

If the United States will do its duty in submitting this issue to the Security Council, it will be the clear duty of the Security Council to accept jurisdiction and to proceed at once to propose and require peaceful procedures for the settlement of the war. It cannot shirk its plain duty under any threat.

If the Security Council will not act, the United States has recourse to the General Assembly under the charter, and the "Uniting for Peace" resolution which the United States sponsored, which the United Nations approved, and under which it has established peacekeeping operations in several critical situations.

The United States, more than any other great power, has supported the United Nations with its resources and the sacrifice of its men in peacekeeping operations.

We recall in 1956 and 1957, conscious as it was of strong ties with Great Britain and Israel, and at that time with France, the United States stood against them in support of the United Nations and in opposition to the use of force in the settlement of disputes.

The situation on Vietnam is increasingly dangerous. The fragile system of international law and order is increasingly shaken.

It is in the interest of the United States, the United Nations, and the world for our country, to submit this issue to the Security Council of the United Nations.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wish to join in expressing the wish that the Security Council take under consideration the situation in Vietnam, as has been advanced by the majority leader and my colleagues in the Senate who have spoken to that point. I have expressed my views on this matter before. I have always felt that there should be some kind of international consideration, and that the Security Council is perhaps the best agency for that purpose. The entire framework of the United Nations, including the General Assembly and the Security Council, was set up with the idea of helping to maintain peace throughout the world. Certainly this agency should be called upon to help bring peace to Vietnam.

I agree with the statement of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] that the Vietnam situation is dangerous. Any war is dangerous, and it is for that purpose that the United Nations was organized. In order that there might be quick action when required, the Security Council was given a particularly definite and strong place in the keeping of the peace.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this matter be permitted to proceed for another 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I have supported our policy in South Vietnam, and I still support it. Our objective has been to assist the South Vietnamese in their struggle against aggression to the end that they may be able to have a government of their choosing and that they may live in peace.

Our Government has all along shown a willingness to meet at the conference table. We have advocated negotiations to settle this war. We have shown a willingness to have the Security Council assume jurisdiction. We have requested that such be done.

I believe that the time is here for such action and I earnestly join with my colleagues in urging such action by either the Security Council or, if because of the veto there it cannot be done, then, in the General Assembly.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] mentioned a proceeding under which the matter could be carried to the General Assembly under the resolution "Uniting for Peace." That resolution was first advanced in 1950. The Senator from Kentucky and I were members of the United Nations delegation that year. Certainly we should urge that action be taken and I believe it can be helpful and forceful.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I join the distinguished majority leader in his concept that the United States should submit the Vietnam question to the Security Council of the United Nations. As the able Senator from Montana has

pointed out, a U.S. resolution has been on the Security Council's agenda since early 1966. We should insist on some action regarding this resolution by the United Nations.

One of the aspects of this struggle which too many people seem to forget at the moment is that even before the Geneva accord was signed in 1954, the Vietcong was actively engaged, by means of force, cruelty, and terror, in trying physically to take over the area of South Vietnam.

As one who had the honor to serve as a representative of the U.S. Senate at the 17th General Assembly in 1962, I have been disappointed at the reaction of the United Nations toward this conflict, which can, we must admit, affect the peace and future of the world. I have also been extremely disappointed in the actions of the Secretary General. It seems to me that, too often, the words and actions of the Secretary General have been designed more to make the United States appear as an imperialistic nation rather than to make us appear for what we really are; namely, a nation desiring only to see that the physical security of South Vietnam is made whole, and that the people have a right and an opportunity to develop their economic and political viability.

Mr. President, article 1 of the Charter of the United Nations sets forth the purposes of this unique organization. Among those purposes is the maintenance of international peace and security. If the United Nations is ever to live up to this objective it seems to me that now is the time for the United Nations to do it.

Thus, I say that the challenge is clear. I think we should submit the question to the United Nations—to which we have contributed so much, not only in the quest for peace but also in our willingness to commit our dollars—with the idea that we would be submitting the question to the one organization in the world in which almost every major and minor country participates.

I think the words today of the distinguished majority leader in this respect are entirely correct. I hope that many others will agree with him.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the war in Vietnam has become a national tragedy.

Never in this history this Republic has so much been sacrificed for so little.

If there is any possible way for the United Nations to expedite the settlement of this wretched war, then the Government of the United States should relentlessly pursue each avenue within the U.N. that holds out, however faintly, some promise of action for peace.

It has been said that recourse to the United Nations will prove futile, that a resolution in the Security Council, if followed up, will lead only to a Russian veto.

If this is so, I join in the sentiments expressed by the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], we should let the onus fall upon the Soviet Union.

It has also been said that, inasmuch as neither the Government or North Vietnam nor China are members of the United Nations, and since they refuse to

recognize or acknowledge the competency of the United Nations to deal with the war in Southeast Asia, it is pointless to pursue the matter further in the U.N.

But no one can know, for sure, what Ho Chi Minh would do if he were confronted with a U.N. resolution calling for a cease-fire and setting forth terms for the settlement of the war.

We should not be dissuaded by such arguments from carrying the matter, as far as we can, in the United Nations. For none of us has the capacity to foretell or accurately to predict the future actions of either the Government of North Vietnam or the Government of China.

Finally, it has been intimated that world opinion may have so settled against us in Vietnam that a resolution could emerge in the United Nations, if it were pressed for there, that would be unacceptable to the United States.

If this is so, then it is time for the American people to know it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Montana has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if Senators will concur with me, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, we have an obligation to our fighting men in Vietnam to follow every path in the United Nations which could contribute to a peaceful settlement of the war. The possible paths are several:

There is the role played by the Secretary General, who has already tried, when occasions were opportune, to find the diplomatic doors which might lead to the negotiating table. There is the possibility for action in the Security Council, if we were to press for a vote on our resolution. Should a veto actually be cast, either by the Soviet Union or by France, then, of course, there is the resolution-for-peace procedure which might take the matter to the General Assembly.

In any case, I think we must not be remiss in exploring each of these paths. If they all lead to a dead end, how can we know it without going the distance?

I join the distinguished majority leader and other Members of the Senate this morning who have urged this course of action—and I recommend it strongly to the President of the United States.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the majority leader and other Senators who have spoken on bringing the Vietnam conflict to the Security Council.

The present greatest threat to world peace is the struggle in Vietnam. The greatest source of international criticism of the United States is the war it is conducting there. It is the most discouraging and frustrating war in which our Nation has been involved. Yet, the one forum where the entire question may be aired has not been utilized in the search for a way out. I refer, of course, to the Security Council of the United Nations.

The tragic irony of the situation is that more than a year ago, in late January of 1966, the United States managed

to have the question of Vietnam placed on the agenda of the Security Council.

In my view, the time is ripe for a renewal of this initiative, and the Security Council is the appropriate site. For two of the permanent members of the Security Council are also cochairmen of the Geneva Conference, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union. Two current members of the Council, Canada and India, are members of the International Control Commission on Indochina, set up at Geneva. I believe it would be appropriate if the other member of that Commission, Poland, which is also a UN member, be invited to participate in the discussions, and I would think that every other party directly or indirectly concerned also be invited.

I do not believe that bringing the Vietnam conflict to the United Nations would be damaging to the United Nations or the United States. For the United Nations is hurt when it avoids its responsibilities, not when it attempts to grapple with them. The United States is hurt in the eyes of many people, as long as it does not appear to be utilizing the means most readily at hand for the maintenance of international peace and security, the United Nations. The United Nations is the arena where the nations put themselves on the record. Even if that record should be critical of this country, it is better to face that criticism openly, and to demonstrate that the United States is fully committed to exploring every feasible avenue in the search for peace. As a former U.S. delegate to the U.N., I urge this initiative.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator.

I yield now to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART].

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I consider it both a responsibility and a privilege to take part in this significant discussion here today, for I have been and am deeply convinced of the need to utilize the full potential of the United Nations Security Council in seeking an honorable way to peace in Vietnam. And I am proud to associate myself with the efforts of the distinguished majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD], the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and other Senators who have long championed this important initiative.

The Security Council under the U.N. Charter has more than adequate power and authority to aid a solution of the Vietnam problem. There are many approaches which the Council might follow, including direct actions by the Council or indirect approaches calling on other bodies to act. This is not the place to try to advocate a proper course of action for the Council to take, but it may be useful to suggest some of the many possibilities open to it. As the Security Council Resolution introduced on January 31, 1966, by Ambassador Goldberg states, the Council could call for "immediate discussions with preconditions to arrange a conference looking toward the application of the Geneva Accords of 1954 and 1962 and the establishment of a durable peace in Southeast Asia." As a first step, it might arrange for a cessation of hostilities under effective supervision, as the U.S. resolution states.

U.N. authorities, peacekeeping forces and observer groups, some authorized by the Security Council and others by the General Assembly, have successfully performed a number of peacemaking functions which could have application in Vietnam. These include the separation of opposing forces, facilitating their withdrawal, sealing off borders, observing and reporting on border violations, maintaining internal order, and supervising the conduct of elections. The many techniques of peaceful settlement mentioned in chapter VI of the charter include arbitration and mediation, both of which are specifically mentioned in the U.S. draft resolution of January 31, 1966.

If the Security Council should summon a meeting of all relevant parties to discuss the situation in Vietnam, there is of course no absolute assurance that the Council, with all its influence, would succeed in ending hostilities and restoring conditions of peace, where so many other major efforts have failed. But at least, Mr. President, a clearer understanding of the respective positions of the interested parties should emerge. Moreover, the organ of the United Nations with primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security would at least have been an effort to carry out its grave responsibilities. On a matter so vital to hopes for a peaceful world, Mr. President, I believe our Government, following the elections in South Vietnam on September 3 and the establishment of a constitutional government, should press with utmost vigor in the Council for the fullest exploration of the Vietnam problem. This is necessary as a warranty of our own good faith in the United Nations as the international community's principal organ of peace, as well as a demonstration of our sincere hopes that the conflict in Vietnam can be honorably settled.

As the able senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has just pointed out, there are many concerned Americans who do not realize our Government has even seriously suggested the Security Council move on the Vietnam problem. Small wonder if persons elsewhere in the world have no awareness of our effort to have the Security Council move.

When I returned in June from a visit to Vietnam and several other Asian nations, I recommended every effort be made to bring the United Nations actively into the resolution of the Vietnam conflict. It is a tragic war; its end must be had. There were those who replied, then and now, that the United Nations is too entangled with procedural and power conflicts to be a means of ending the war. That is no reason for not making an honest effort. It is the best instrument we have at hand. We must use it. As the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] has just pointed out, we should and must do all that is possible in pursuit of this course.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, before I yield to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], I think it should be stated for the RECORD that he is the one man in the Senate who has been in the forefront of the proposal to take this matter

to the Security Council of the United Nations. He has advanced many legal arguments in respect to his position, and it has taken time for some of those arguments to sink in and the validity of his proposals to be taken at their real value.

Before I yield to him, I think I should point out that of those Senators who have spoken this morning, nine of us have been former U.S. delegates to the United Nations, and I think that speaks well of those who have had the privilege and opportunity to represent this country in that body to make their feelings known on this particular occasion.

So I now yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the majority leader honors me by yielding to me. I appreciate very much his comments, but he has been my leader from the very beginning.

With reference to our being members of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations, I want to say that I have been convinced for a long, long time that it is of the utmost importance that the signatories to the United Nations Charter should assume their obligations to the charter by themselves voting to take United Nations jurisdiction over the matter.

I quite agree with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] that the responsibility is not a responsibility of the United States alone. It is the responsibility of Russia and France, too, because it is frequently said they would veto such a resolution in the Security Council. But it is also the responsibility of Canada, of Great Britain, of Japan—yes, of India, of the Latin American countries.

It is the responsibility of each and every signatory to the charter, for their signatures carried a pledge that when there was a threat to the peace anywhere in the world, they would join in a united action to enforce the peace. That is the obligation which every signatory to the charter has, and each is derelict to its responsibility under its signature in not carrying out multilateral action in trying to bring to an end this threat to the peace of the world.

In my opinion, the United States cannot bring about peace to the world on a bilateral negotiated basis. I think it is hopeless. We can bring about a truce; we can kill and injure enough people to force a surrender. That will not bring peace. It only means that for decades to come we will continue to sacrifice hundreds of thousands of Americans in Vietnam.

I am sure I am not violating any confidence in saying that on May 1 and May 3 the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Montana had conversations with the President and his foreign policy advisers as we pressed on that group to submit this matter for final determination. I want to make that comment because the President of the United States is being unfairly criticized in many quarters. The President of the United States has tried, and he has continued to try, to find an honorable way to settle this dispute. I do not mean to imply that the President agrees with my

position or the position of the Senator from Montana, but he is openminded about it. That is why he asked to consult with us. He is openminded about it.

We ourselves need to press before the United Nations a different type of resolution than the United States has submitted, for we have yet to send a resolution that deals with the substantive issue. I have prepared legal memorandums with regard to our relations vis-a-vis Asia. In these memorandums I pointed out that we have to submit a resolution in which we propose a means of dealing with Vietnam. I have urged that we pledge to abide by whatever final resolution the U.N. may adopt. That we have not done. The only resolution we have sent to the United Nations is one in which we asked the Security Council to put it on its agenda. That is where it is going to stay until the United States fulfills its complete commitment—namely, asking the Security Council to take jurisdiction and pledging that we will abide by the result. That is what we mean by the substitution of international law for the law of the jungle. It means that if the Security Council takes jurisdiction and says we must cease the bombing, that we cease the bombing; or if it says we must draw lines we can defend, then we must draw lines we can defend; or if it says, "Take your troops home," that we take them home.

We are either going to be a party to the substitution of the law of the world as we find it in international law doctrines or we are going to continue to alienate and isolate ourselves from the world, because we are substituting the jungle law of military might. We are seeking to supplant the rule of law with American military domination.

So I think it is highly important that we submit such a resolution. I have said this so many times during the last 4 years, but I say it once again, because it needs to be said, because the people must understand that we are not going to be able to establish peace on any basis of a unilateral policeman's rule.

We have to do more than that. I think we wish to make perfectly clear that if the Security Council does veto such a resolution, then our President will appeal to the world through the General Assembly of the United Nations. Read the charter again. I have pleaded for years that we establish the precedent whereby we ask for a session of the General Assembly to enforce peace in Southeast Asia. I am sorry that precedent was established by Russia in connection with the Middle East. We should have established it 3 years ago in connection with Southeast Asia.

But, Mr. President, that power exists. Do you know what I think would happen if we went to the General Assembly, and offered to abide by the jurisdiction of the United Nations? I think we would get a minimum of 80 votes in the General Assembly.

One of the reasons we need to follow this course of action is that the nations of the world do not like to countervene the United States. We are the most powerful Nation on earth. In fact, we give foreign aid to more than 90 of them. It

is a little difficult to get countries to go against us when they are also recipients of our aid.

But we owe just this to the next generation, and the next and the next, of American boys and girls. As public officers, we ought to think beyond the next election and in terms of the next century. If we are to lay a foundation for the peace of the world for centuries to come, then we must stop this unilateral course of action we are following in Southeast Asia, which, in my judgment, day by day moves us closer to the danger of the massive war involving Red China, and ultimately involving Russia.

So I plead again for support for the majority leader, and for support for the President, because I think if once it becomes understood by the American people that we no longer have the right, unilaterally, to tell Asia what its course of action shall be, then the American people will make clear that they want our Government to seek to bring a multilateral solution to this problem instead of a unilateral U.S. solution. We will then have some chance of substituting the rule of law for our military might.

Do not forget, Mr. President, the United Nations Charter does not exclude the possibility of bringing in, under either Security Council jurisdiction or General Assembly jurisdiction, an expanded membership for this specific purpose. That is why, more than 3 years ago, in one of the memorandums I prepared, I urged General Assembly jurisdiction, including the Geneva Accords members, with their membership expanded. That would bring in the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese, and provide the answer to the argument that because they are not members of the United Nations, therefore the United Nations is not the suitable body.

Read the United Nations Charter. It does not call for the enforcement of peace involving only members of the United Nations. The United Nations Charter calls for the enforcement of peace no matter what nations, members or nonmembers, are violating the peace of the world.

We can very well consider a United Nations jurisdiction expanded to include nations that are not members, making perfectly clear that whether they come in and cooperate or not, the peace will be enforced.

I shall not take the time to review again, for the consideration of the Senate, the number of instances in the life of the United Nations in which peace has been enforced. But do not forget it was the United Nations that prevented the outbreak of a war between Pakistan and India. Do not forget that it is the United Nations that maintains peace in Cyprus today. Do not forget it was the United Nations that moved into the Congo. Do not forget that besides its so-called troop enforcement policies, the United Nations, as has been pointed out in one of the speeches today, through the Secretary General, has intervened many times to seek to bring to an end a growing threat to the peace of the world.

I close, Mr. President, by saying that our Government and the people of our

country, as well as the governments of all the other nations in the world and their people, including, for example, West Germany—which is not a member of the United Nations, but nevertheless a great power in Europe—ought to throw their moral influence on the side of peace in Southeast Asia. They should do that, instead of seeking, as Germany has done up until this moment, including during the recent visit of its Chancellor to the United States, to evade and avoid discussion of the threat to the peace of the world in Southeast Asia; for that threat involves the German people as well as the Russians, the British, the French, the Canadians and the people of the United States.

Mr. President, I believe that here is an opportunity to demonstrate to our President that we would back him up completely if he made the appeal that I think should be made to the United Nations to take over jurisdiction, to the end that this war might be settled by multilateral action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, first I wish to compliment our majority leader for the leadership he has taken in—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair informs the Senator from Texas that there is no time available, unless it be obtained by unanimous consent.